

7 spaced one from the other at the entrance to said notches, said cover being configured and  
8 dimensioned to be seated on said base in a closed position enclosing said top surface, with said  
9 trunnions received in said notches and in contact with said trunnion travel surfaces, the spacing  
10 between said ledge surfaces and said tabs relative to the external dimensions of said trunnions  
11 being such as to permit unimpeded vertical movement of said cover between said closed  
12 position and a raised position removed from said base, said trunnion travel surfaces being  
13 slidable over said trunnions during rotation of said cover about said trunnions between said  
14 closed position and an inclined open position at which said ledge surfaces abut said trunnions  
15 to prevent rotation of said cover beyond said open position and said tabs underlie and are  
16 engageable with said trunnions to impede vertical removal of said cover from said base, said  
17 cover when in said open position providing access to said tube-receiving openings.

---

**REMARKS**

Claim 26 has been amended to obviate the examiner's objections to the drawing and specification, as well as the '112 objections to the claims.

With regard to the examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, as now amended, claim 26 more specifically defines the notches 52 as including trunnion travel surfaces 56 extending between ledge surfaces 58 and tabs 60 spaced one from the other at the notch entrances. As now set forth in claim 26, the spacing between the ledge surfaces and tabs is such as to permit unimpeded vertical removal of the cover from the base. Moreover, the notch configurations are such that the trunnion surfaces slide over the trunnions during rotation of the cover to its open position, with the ledge surfaces being engageable with the trunnions to limit further cover rotation beyond its fully open position, and with the tabs underlying and

being engageable with the trunnions to impede vertical removal of the thus opened cover from the base.

Sliding movement of the trunnion travel surfaces 56 on the trunnions 36 allows the cover to shift rearwardly as it rotates to the open position, and this in turn provides improved access to test tubes stored in the rack. Support for this slidable motion is provided in the specification at page 6, lines 15-16.

As the examiner has correctly noted, Laska does not disclose the use of a rotatable and removable cover comprising a notch, wherein the notch includes a trunnion travel surface and a ledge surface, or a base comprising a trunnion.

However, contrary to the position the examiner has taken, these deficiencies are not remedied by Corsi et al., Aiken, Hawk or Yuhara.

More particularly, in Corsi et al., each of the embodiments includes a cover snap-fitted to the base. The embodiment of Figures 3-5 has a cover 12 snap-fitted to the base 14 (Col. 4, lines 1-10). The same is true of the embodiment of Figures 6-9 (Col. 5, lines 16-17) and the embodiment of Figures 10-13 (Col. 6, lines 8-9). With each of the embodiments in Corsi et al., the cover must be forcibly separated from the base, and thus the hinges impede that separation.

Aiken suffers from the same drawback. The Aiken hinge includes resilient elements 32 on the lid 120 that "meet and spring toward" a hinge pin 36 on the receptacle 14. (See Col. 4, lines 34-37). Here again, it would be necessary to forcible separate the lid 120 from the receptacle because the snap fit of the elements 32 around the hinge pin 36 would impede such separation.

154 is my  
extra  
hook  
snap-fitted base  
125  
Col 4 line 63  
Col 5  
to snap fit  
118 x  
141

4  
Snap?

Hawk fails to disclose or suggest hinge notches having trunnion travel surfaces extending between ledge surfaces and tabs spaced one from the other at the notch entrances, with the ledge surfaces being engageable with the trunnions to limit the extent to which the cover can be opened, and with the tabs being positioned to engage the trunnions and thereby prevent removal of the thus opened cover from the container base. To the extent that the Hawk disclosure can be understood, there is no relative translational movement between the notch surface 23 and the rim 12, nor is there an equivalent to the dual action provided by the applicants' ledge surfaces 58 and tabs 60, the former serving to limit the extent to which the cover can be opened, and the latter serving to prevent separation of the opened cover from the base.

Yuhara is merely another example of a snap-fit hinge. See for example Col. 12, lines 37-54 which describes the hinge groove 84 as aiding in the expansion of the slit 77 as the hinge pin 66 is forced into the hinge pin hole 86.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that any combination of Laska with Corsi et al, Aiken, Hawk or Yuhara fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 26 as presently amended. It is believed, therefore, that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Attached hereto is a sheet entitled "Version Showing Amendments to the Claims" on which claim 26 has been reproduced with brackets and underlining.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Maurice E. Gauthier  
Registration No. 20,798  
Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens  
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Telephone: (617) 426-9180  
Extension 113